

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 3 have been amended to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention, and new claims 4 – 21 have been added to provide a more complete scope of protection for the present invention. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed under separate cover.

Support for modifications to claim 1 is provided in paragraphs [0004], [0006], [0007], [0009], [0010] and [0015], and in Figs. 1-3 which each depict client interaction sessions (i.e., blocks 3 and 5), a data source (e.g., block 9) and client devices exemplified via components with reference numerals 1 and 4. Support for new claim 4 is provided in paragraph [0009]. Support for new claim 5 is provided in paragraph [0015] and in Fig. 1, 2 or 3. Support for new claim 6 is provided in paragraphs [0007] and [0010] of the specification. Support for new claims 9, 18 and 19 is provided in paragraphs [0007], [0009] and [0010] of the specification. Also, the Figs. 1-3 each show no connection to the database from a back end data server or application. Support for new claim 10 is provided in paragraph [0015] of the specification. Support for new claim 11 is provided in paragraphs [0009] and [0019] of the specification. Support for new claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 20 and 21 is provided in paragraphs [0009], [0015] and [0017] of the specification. Support for new claim 15 is provided in paragraph [0009]. Support for new claims 16 and 17 is provided in Fig. 1, 2 or 3 which each depict a connection to the database by other session management

gateways. No new matter is believed to be added to the present application by virtue of this amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended herein are believed to overcome this basis for rejection of the claims and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,751,453, to Schemers et al (hereinafter referred to as the Schemers et al patent). As will be discussed in further detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the Schemers et al patent fails to teach or suggest several claimed features of the invention.

The Schemers et al patent relates to voice message retrieval during a wireless application protocol (WAP) session. With reference to Fig. 1 of the Schemers et al patent, a subscriber accesses information regarding voice mails and e-mails stored in a message store 118 by establishing a WAP session with a gateway server 150 and accessing a web server 105. The web server 105 queries a telephony server 115 via an application program 125 for information relating to voice messages stored for the mobile station subscriber at the message store 118. A script program 130 sends objects for display at the mobile station relating to stored voice messages available for playback for that subscriber. Once a message is selected, a script program 130 causes the mobile state to terminate the WAP session and dial the telephony server to playback the selected message. The telephony server 115 is connected to a state

server 110 that stores subscriber phone numbers, voice message identifiers and operation codes. The state server 110 returns voice message identifiers and operation codes in response to queries from the telephony server 115 to operate the telephony server 115 in accordance with the operation code to playback the message as desired by the user. Upon completion of the voice message and termination of the phone call, the mobile station re-establishes a WAP session with the server 150 and the most recently viewed web page that was loaded into the browser 155 at the mobile station 140.

None of the devices disclosed in the Schemers et al patent (e.g., the web server 105, the application program 125, the script program and the state server 110) stores session data relating to a transaction session as recited in claims 1, 9, 18 or 19, nor relates a user to a transaction session regardless of the access medium, client interface device, and so on. The message store 118 and the state server 110 in the Schemers et al patent merely store, respectively, voice messages, and subscriber phone numbers, voice message identifiers and operation codes. Unlike the invention recited in claim 1, which supports multiple phases whereby a user can call back at a later time, a user of the Schemers et al system cannot terminate a session with the application 125 and script program 130 to retrieve messages, and then re-establish the same session at a later time. In the Schemers et al patent, the script program 130 guides the call to the telephony server 115 and the reestablishment of the WAP session and not the user. The invention recited in claim 1, on the other hand, allows the user to drop calls and initiate a later call to continue a transaction session with no script or back end control

over or knowledge of when and how one session is terminated and a new one is established. The present invention shields this information from the back end application and/or script. The script program in Schemer's patent only allows re-establishment of a WAP session after message retrieval from the telephony server 115 if the script program has not been interrupted. As stated in the abstract of the Schemers et al patent, "Responsive thereto,...., the data session is *automatically* terminated, and a phone call is placed,..." Thus, the Schemer's et al patent does not teach user control over this action, but rather full back end control and knowledge of it, unlike the present invention wherein the claimed session management gateway operates independently of the back end and the client devices. Claim 1 further recites a transaction session as having two components, that is, a client interaction session and a separate data source interaction session, and storage of session data corresponding to the transaction session at different steps of a transaction, among other aspects of the invention.

Independent claim 9 similarly recites a transaction session and storage of transaction session data, as well as use of the transaction data to map subsequent sessions initiated by the user, among other aspects of the invention. Independent claim 18 recites initiation of a second client interface session at a user device after termination of a first client interface session, as well as storage of session data relating to a transaction session in a memory device associated with a session management gateway. The Schemers et al patent does not teach or suggest a device similar to the session management gateway, that is, which is downstream of an application or other

data source, saves session data at different steps of a transaction, and maps client interaction sessions to the transaction session via user identification data. In addition, independent claim 19 recites a transaction session similarly to claim 1, and storage of session data similar to claim 9, that is, storage of session data independently of the information site, the application site, the business logic, the client device, and the access medium employed by the client device to establish an interaction session to access the session management gateway to participate in the transaction.

Further, the system components disclosed in the Schemers et al patent are specific to voicemail and e-mail message retrieval during a data session. By contrast, the operation of the session management gateway, as recited in claims 6, 9 and 19, is independent of the data source (e.g., the information site or the application site) and is therefore not application-specific.

The system disclosed in the Schemers et al patent requires at least two applications, that is, the application 125 and a script program 130. The session management gateway of the present invention need only connect to a single application, as recited in claim 10.

In addition, the voicemail messaging system 100 disclosed in the Schemers et al patent employs a state server that is deployed upstream or behind an application, and not downstream of an application as recited in claims 5, 9, 18 and 20. Further, the Schemers et al patent does not disclose or suggest a messaging system 100 that supports multiple phases or sessions therewith using different user devices for different phases, as recited in claims 4 and 10. Only the mobile station 140 is used

Appl. No. 10/067,968

Amdt. dated November 29, 2004


Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2004

throughout the processes disclosed in Figs. 5 and 7 of the Schemers et al patent.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this basis for rejecting the claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Stacey J. Longanecker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,952

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: 29 November, 2004